

REMARKS

A. Introduction

Claims 1-8 were pending and under consideration in the application.

In the Office Action of March 15, 2011 claims 1- 8 were rejected.

With this amendment, claims 1, 4 and 8 are amended and claim 6 is cancelled.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Lambino* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0184435) (“Lambino”) in view of *Curry* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,032,248) (“Curry”).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Lambino* in view of *Aasheim* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,178,061) (“Aasheim”)

In relevant part, representative independent claim 1 recites storing a block state information indicating that a data block is faulty or not faulty in a leading page of each of the data blocks storing a boot program instruction. Claim 8 recites a similar feature.

In the Office Action of March 15, 2011, the Examiner correctly asserts that *Lambino* fails to disclose “the block state information is stored in a leading page of each of the blocks storing boot program instructions.” See, Office Action of March 15, 2011 at Page 4.

Curry fails to cure this deficiency. Instead *Curry* merely discloses each storage page within a data space having a redundant storage page. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,032,248, Col. 12, l 12-21. This cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing storing a block state information indicating that a data block is faulty or not faulty in a leading page of each of the data blocks storing a boot program instruction because *Curry* only discloses redundant storage pages without disclosing anything pertaining to block state information.

Aasheim, similarly, fails to disclose or even fairly suggest anything pertaining to block state information, much less storing a block state information indicating that a data block is faulty or not faulty in a leading page of each of the data blocks storing a boot program instruction.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by storing a block state information indicating that a data block is faulty or not faulty in a leading page of each of the data blocks storing a boot program instruction, the CPU can execute a boot program stably every time the boot program is requested. See, U.S. Pat. No. 2008/0046637, Para. [0055].

Therefore, because *Lambino*, *Curry*, *Aasheim* and any possible combination of them fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every features of claims 1 and 8, the rejection of claims 1 and 8 cannot stand. Because claims 2-7 depend, either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 8, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

C. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-8 are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that, for any reason, direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below, for purposes of arranging for a telephonic interview. Any communication initiated by this paragraph should be deemed an Applicant-Initiated Interview.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SNR DENTON US LLP

By /David R. Metzger/
David R Metzger, Reg. No. 32,919
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
312-876-8000 (telephone)
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS